

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 31, 2003, claims 1, 10, 13 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-16 and 18 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

Record is made of a telephonic interview between Applicants' attorney Edmond A. DeFrank and Examiner J. Nguyen on March 29, 2004. The Office Action of December 31, 2003, the cited references and the pending claims were discussed. A proposed amendment modifying claims 1, 10, 13 and 18 was discussed during the interview. Although no agreement was reached, the above amendments to the claims reflect the discussion between the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney during the interview.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6, 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Daniels (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,500). Next, the Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 10-16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Aratani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,675).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The independent claims include manipulating and sharing data between a main window of one computer and a picture window of another computer by dragging data from one window and dropping the data into the other window using the input device.

In contrast, neither Daniels et al. nor Aratani et al. disclose all of the Applicants' claimed features. For example, Daniels et al. simply disclose the ability to toggle between a main display area and a picture in picture window. In particular, Daniels can only display two windows on one screen and simply toggle between the two windows. Also, Aratani et al. merely disclose a display system that receives image data from a plurality of image sources and displays the received image data on a display unit.

However, clearly, **none** of the cited references disclose manipulating and sharing data between a main window of one computer and a picture window of another computer by dragging data from one window and dropping the data into the other window, like the Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, neither Daniels et al. nor Aratani et al. anticipate the claims. As such, the Applicants' respectfully submit that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aratani et al. in view of Ur (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,283).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because at least **one** of the Applicants' claimed elements are missing from or not taught in the cited references and the Applicant's invention has advantages not appreciated by the cited references.

Specifically, the cited references, when combined, are missing the Applicants' claimed "manipulating and sharing data" between a main window of one computer and a picture window of another computer "...by dragging data from one window and dropping the data into the other window using the input device." Nowhere in Aratani et al. nor in Ur is the Applicants' claimed dragging data from one window and dropping the data into the other window. Hence, the combination of the Aratani et al. reference with the Ur reference does **not** disclose all of the elements of the Applicants' claims, and thus, **cannot** render the Applicants' invention obvious. In Re Evanega. This **failure** of the cited references, either alone or in combination, to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness (*MPEP 2143*).

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (*MPEP* § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the subject application are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an

Serial No.: 09/758,732
Attorney Docket No.: AUS9-2000-0598-US1

effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: March 31, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX